
A N
ACCOUNT
OF AN
Occasional Conference
BETWEEN

George Keith *and* Thomas Upshare
at Colchester, Jan. 1. 17⁰⁰₀₁

A N
ACCOUNT



Occasional Conference

BETWEEN

George Keith and Thomas Elphinstone
at Colchester, Jan. 1. 1760.

457

A N
ACCOUNT
O F A N
Occasional Conference
B E T W E E N

George ^KKeith and Thomas Upshare
at Colchester, Jan. 1. 17⁰⁰₀₁.

Mr. Kinnier, John Rallet, and John Sewel,
being present.

T O G E T H E R

With some Notes and Observations on *Thomas Upshare's*
Concessions and Answers; and a Postscript.

Some other material Passages relating to the Quakers in
Colchester, their Principles and late Differences.

And some Passages faithfully collected out of a Printed Epistle of
George Fox, call'd, *A General Epistle*, &c. printed in the Year 1662.
and some Observations on the same.

L O N D O N :

Printed by R. Janeway, for B. Aylmer, at the *Three Pidgeons* in
Cornhil; and C. Brome, at the *Gun* in *Ludgate-street*, near
the *West-end* of *St. Paul's Church*, MDCCL.

AN ACCOUNT

OF AN
Occasional Conference

HELD AT

George Kirk's Tavern, Upper
at Colebrook Dale, 1783.



Mr. Kinnear, John Koller, and John ...
being present.

TOGETHER

With some Notes and Observations on ...
Conventions and Answers, and a ...

Some other material Passages relating to the ...
Catholics, their Principles and late Differences.

And some Passages faithfully collected out of a Printed ...
... and some Observations on the same.

LONDON:

Printed by R. Youngman, for B. Aylmer, at the ...
... and C. B. ... at the ...
the West end of St Paul's Church, MDCCCL.

*An Account of an Occasional Conference between
George Keith and Thomas Upshare, in
the Presence of Mr. Kinnier, John Rallet,
and John Sewel, at Colchester in Essex,
Jan. 1. 1701.*

MR. *Kinnier* being Minister of the Parish, began first of all to expostulate with *Thomas Upshare* in sundry Particulars, both of the Quakers Doctrine and Management. Namely, He urged him to prove *George Keith* an Apostate from God; to dispute with him concerning Infant-Baptism. How he could reconcile his late Orthodox Preaching *Christ without*, with ancient Friend's Books? How these Books can be accounted otherwise than Quaker Principles, since these were the Fathers and Fountain of Quakerism, and are not disowned at this Day by the modern Quakers. How he could be hindred by Friends not to dispute with *George Keith* [since not long ago he did so majestically speak of *John Rallet* in his own Person, viz. That he would not slightly heal the Breaches *John Rallet* had made, and that in the Quakers Meeting at *Colchester*?

Mr. *Kinnier* told him farther, (to show Quakers Errors were still among them) of two late particular Instances in that Neighbourhood, viz. One *Daniel Vandeval*, who denied that Jesus Christ had any real Humane Body in Heaven, and yet that he did interceed for Sinners there, (in the Presence of Mr. Mayor and several of the Aldermen of *Colchester*;) being question'd by Mr. *Raoul*, the other of one (*Tho. Beale*) a grave Quaker, who question'd severely with *John Rallet* for preaching up the Resurrection of the Dead, which

Thomas Beale said was preaching down the Friend's Doctrine that they had been preaching up for 40 Years. So *John Rallet* himself told Mr. *Kinner*, and he told *Thomas Upshare* before *John Rallet*. To all which *Thomas Upshare* said very little, only that he would not be catechised by Mr *Kinnier*, neither did he believe him.

At last Mr. *Kinnier* put this complex Question to *Thomas Upshare*; viz. If the *Light within* was sufficient to Salvation without any thing else? And if it gave us any Account of Jesus Christ without Scripture Revelation? To which he ventured to say something, and that occasioned the following Conference.

Thomas Upshare reply'd, It was not needful that the *Light within* him should teach him that without Scripture, because the Scripture had taught that already.

George Keith reply'd, That was no direct Answer to the Question, and he desired him to give a direct Answer, which he would not do for some considerable time; at last, being much desired to give a direct Answer, he plainly said, The *Light within* him did not teach him without Scripture, that Christ was born of a Virgin.

George Keith reply'd, One of two things doth necessarily follow from this Confession, either that *Thomas Upshare* thinks it not necessary to our Salvation to believe that Christ was born of a Virgin; or if it be necessary to our Salvation, the *Light within* is not sufficient to Salvation without Scripture, and without Christ's Birth of the Virgin, his Death and Sufferings, and Mediation without us in Heaven; all which are something else than the *Light within*.

Thomas Upshare said, The *Light within* is God and Christ, and is not God and Christ sufficient to save without any thing else?

George Keith reply'd, The *Light within* is not whole Christ, God and Man, is not Christ's Manhood, and Christ's Manhood is concern'd in our Salvation, as well as his Godhead.

Thomas Upshare. Christ is not divided from his *Light within*.

George Keith. Tho' Christ is not divided, yet we ought to distinguish betwixt his Godhead and his Manhood; also betwixt Christ and God, as within us, and his Inspiration and Illumination.

Thomas

Thomas Upshare. The Inspiration of God is the Spirit, for which he quoted that in *Job*, *There is a Spirit in Man, and the Inspiration of the Almighty giveth Understanding*, *Job* 32. 8.

George Keith. That Scripture doth not prove that the Inspiration of the Spirit, is the Spirit himself; or that the Illumination of Christ and God, is Christ and God: for the Inspiration and Illumination are but the Work and Operation of God, and of Christ, and of the Spirit; we must not confound the Work with the Workman; the Inspiration and Illumination are things done in time; but the Spirit, and Christ considered as God, were before all time.

To make us understand you more plainly, I ask you, *Thomas Upshare*, Have ye the same Inspiration in kind, which *Moses*, and *David*, and the Prophets, and Apostles had?

Thomas Upshare. What dost thou mean by the same Inspiration in Kind? We do not pretend to the same Degree.

George Keith. I do not ask you concerning the same Degree, but have ye the same Kind? By the same Kind, I mean such an Inspiration as taught *Moses*, and *David*, and the Prophets, and Apostles, that Christ was to be born of a Virgin, &c. as was accordingly fulfilled, and their Inspiration taught them this, without all Help of Man, or Book; have ye this kind of Inspiration?

Thomas Upshare after some time fairly confess'd, that he had no such kind of Inspiration, as above-mention'd, neither did he know any of his Friends that had it.

George Keith. I am glad of this your Confession, and I shall make this following Improvement of it. *First*, If so, that the Quakers are greatly to blame, for so severely accusing the Church of *England*, for saying they have not the same Inspiration in Kind that the Prophets and Apostles had that taught them without Scripture the great Mysteries of the Christian Faith; for *Thomas Upshare* hath said the same. *Secondly*, They are to blame for their Separation from the Church of *England*, for this Difference in Doctrine in such a main Fundamental, which is the Foundation of all the other Differences betwixt them, whereas there is no such Difference by *Thomas Upshare's* Confession. *Thirdly*, *Thomas Up-*

share by this Confession contradicts his chiefest Brethren, the Founders of their Religion; as *George Fox*, *George Whitehead*, and *John Fiel*, who has lately printed, That the *Light within* is sufficient to save without any thing else.

Thomas Upshare. I am not to answer for others.

George Keith. But ye profess ye are all of one Faith.

Thomas Upshare. The *Light within* being God, is sufficient to reveal to us Christ's Birth without Scripture.

George Keith. The Question is not, What God can reveal, for who denies that? But the true Question is, What sufficient Revelation hath God given to us, that is sufficient without Scripture, to teach us, that Christ was born of a Virgin, and other great Mysteries of the Christian Faith, contained in the Apostle's Creed.

Thomas Upshare. But seeing the *Light within* is God, it can sufficiently reveal all Truth necessary to Salvation.

George Keith. *David* saith in the 27th Psalm, *The Lord is my Light, and my Salvation*; how is he our Salvation? As the Author of it, and so he is our *Light*; as the Author of it, by a Metonymy of the Cause getting the name of the Effect; that is frequent in Scripture.

The Question is not concerning God's Sufficiency what he can reveal, but concerning the Sufficiency of the Illumination or Inspiration, which is not God himself, but his Operation and Effect; and that neither doth, nor can, without Scripture, reveal those Mysteries.

Besides, To say the *Light within* is sufficient to Salvation without any thing else, has these two Branches included in it; *First*, That the *Light within*, doth actually reveal, without Scripture, all that is needful to Salvation, which *Thomas Upshare* denies as well as we. *Secondly*, That the *Light within* being God (on Supposition) is sufficient to save us, without any thing else; *i. e.* without Christ's Manhood, and his Death, and Sufferings, Blood, Mediation, &c. but this I deny, for can God without you save you, without his Inward Work of Sanctification, to renew and sanctifie you?

Thomas

Thomas Upshare. Nay.

George Keith. Is not God as omnipotent and sufficient without you as within you? And therefore if it be no Blasphemy to say God cannot save us, as he is simply without us, without his inward Operation in our Hearts to sanctifie us; so it is no Blasphemy to say, God within us cannot save us, by any Operation within us, without what Christ, considered as God and Man, hath done for us without us, by his being a Sacrifice for us, to expiate our Sins by his Death and Sufferings in his Manhood Nature. As God cannot lie, so nor can he contradict his revealed Will and Purpose, which is, *That God hath not appointed us to Wrath, but to obtain Salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us,* 1 Thess. 5. 9. and it is no Blasphemy nor Absurdity to say he cannot gainsay this Revelation of his Holy Will and Purpose; and to say he can, is absurd and blasphemous.

But besides, I offer to prove, that ye, *Thomas Upshare*, doth contradict your self in your former Confessions: Do ye not hold that the *Light within* you is your primary Rule of Faith and Practice?

Thomas Upshare. I do so hold, for that was the Rule of the Holy Patriarchs before Scripture was writ.

George Keith. I deny that the *Light within* the Patriarchs was their Rule. If by Patriarchs ye mean the Fathers, who were not Prophets, for the Scripture distinguisheth betwixt the Fathers and the Prophets, as in *Heb. 1. 1.* And when Prophecy did most abound, as in the Apostle's Days, all were not Prophets, God never taught his Church in any Age by the *Light within* only, or by Divine Inspiration only, and alone.

Thomas Upshare. What then was their Rule when Scripture was not writ.

George Keith. The same that is now our Rule for Matter and Substance, as to the chief Articles of Faith, and Precepts of Life; to wit, the External Word and Doctrine, which was the same before it was committed to writing; and since it was committed to writing, as to the principal things, both of Faith and Practice.

Thomas

Thomas Upshare. Christ is the Law writ in the Heart, and our Rule.

George Keith. I deny it, the Law writ in our Hearts is the Work of Christ, but is not Christ himself no more than the Work is the Workman, the Lawgiver is the Law which are distinct.

Thomas Upshare. I mean that the *Light* or *Spirit within* is our Guide, and by Guide and Rule I mean the same thing.

George Keith. But ye confound things that ye ought to distinguish, Guide and Rule are two things properly speaking, as really as the Law-giver and the Law; the Ruler and the Rule, the King is not the Law, but the chief Ruler and Governour, who governs us by his Law, which is a Rule to us. I grant the Spirit of Christ in us is our Guide and Ruler; but not our Rule, but the Rule whereby he rules us, is the External Word and Doctrine, contained in the Holy Scriptures. In a Rhetorical way of Speech, by a Metonymy or Trope, Christ may be called our Law and Rule, but then the true meaning of it is that he is so, by the Law which he hath outwardly given us in the Holy Scriptures, and which he writeth in our Hearts by his Holy Spirit, as we hear it, or read it, and meditate upon it. The Law writ in our Hearts, according to the new Covenant, being a Transcript or Copy of that writ in our Bible.

And seeing that ye hold that the *Light within* you is your Primary Rule of all Faith and Practice, ye must needs hold that it teacheth you all that ye ought to practice for Faith and Salvation without Scripture, which is a plain Contradiction to your former Confession, that the *Light within* you teacheth you nothing of Christ without you, as he was born of a Virgin, was Crucified, &c. without Scripture, for a Primary Rule is the Original, and teacheth all the Contents of Faith and Practice by it self, without any Secondary Rule; as the Original of a Deed of Sale, Indenture or Contract, telleth all the Contents without the Copy; the Original has no need of the Copy, nor Dependence on it, but the Copy depends on the Original.

Thomas

Thomas Upshare. By the *Light within*, being the Primary Rule, I mean, it is that which principally perswadeth us to believe that the Scripture is true.

George Keith. Ye still confound things that ought to be distinguished; all that follows from thence is, that the Spirit or *Light within*, which ye make to be one, is the Primary Efficient, but not the Primary Rule.

The Spirit of God I grant in the Faithful is the Primary Efficient of all Saving Faith and Knowledge, and of all Holy Practice, but not the Rule, either Primary or Secondary.

Thomas Upshare. This is too Scholastick, I do not understand it.

George Keith appealed to the Auditory, and particularly to *John Sewel*, whether the Distinction was not easie to be understood? who reply'd it was; but said *George Keith*, I will further explain it; Primary Efficient is the principal Worker or Workman, the Primary Rule is the principal Instrument by which he worketh; as the chief Carpenter, Joiner, or Bricklayer, is distinct from the chief Instrument by which he works; so is the Spirit of God, who is the principal Worker and Author, distinct from the Rule or Instrument by which he works in us to beget Faith and Knowledge, and all Holy Obedience, the which chief Instrument or Rule is the Word and Doctrine deliver'd in the Holy Scriptures.

Note, First, That some time after the Conference began, *Thomas Upshare* being much desired both by Mr. *Kinnier*, and *John Sewel* a Quaker at *Colchester*, to prove his Charge against *George Keith*, that he was an Apostate and wicked Man, they could get no Answer from him, but that it was proved already in print. To which *George Keith* reply'd, it was not, and he had answered to all their false Accusations against him sufficiently. *George Keith* farther pressed *Thomas Upshare* to satisfie his Brother *John Sewel* at least in some few, or one Particular, otherwise they were in danger to lose him, who has said, He is not convinced by all that he hath read or heard, that *George Keith* is either an Apostate or wicked Man.

Note also, That *Thomas Upshare* having declared to *John Sewel's* Wife, that he would willingly discourse with any Man that would maintain Infant-Baptism to be a Command of Christ, he having heard, that her Husband and she were for having their Children baptized; and *John Sewel* having proposed *George Keith* to be the Man to discourse with *Thomas Upshare* about that Point, *Thomas Upshare* refused to discourse with him on the same, giving his Reason, that Friends were not willing he should, though for his own part he was willing. *John Sewel* pressed, that at least *George Keith* might be present, only to hear. *Thomas Upshare* reply'd, That Friends will not grant that neither. *George Keith* reply'd, That was a very hard case, that if they think *George Keith* in an Error, they will not so much as let him be present with them, to hear what they have to offer for his Information; but said he, I have more Charity for you, for I invite you, *Thomas Upshare* and *Richard Hoskins*, who was then present, to a Dispute I am to have to morrow with an Anabaptist at Mr. *Kinnier's* House, where they accordingly came.

Note Secondly, That after *Thomas Upshare* had said, it was not needful the *Light within* them, without Scripture, should teach them that Christ was born of a Virgin, because the Scripture had taught that already. He further added, He did not doubt but if they had not the Scripture, the *Light within* them would reveal to them, that Christ was born of a Virgin, or any other thing, if God did see fit, and that it was necessary to Salvation. But this contradicts the Experience of the Heathen Nations, who had no such Revelation given them without Scripture.

Note Thirdly, That *Thomas Upshare's* saying, It was not needful the *Light within*, without Scripture, should teach them that Christ was born of a Virgin, because the Scripture hath told that already, by the same Argument it is not needful that the *Light within* should teach them to deny Ungodliness and Worldly Lusts; as Lying, Theft, Murder, Adultery, &c. because the Scripture hath told already that all these are Sins, and at this Rate there is little or no use for the *Light within*, to teach them any thing of Sin or Duty, by *Thomas Upshare's* Argument.

Note

Note Fourthly, That the Heads of the aforesaid Conference, as here printed, were offered to *Thomas Upshare's* hearing by *George Keith*, allowing him to make what Amendments he thought fit in them, if he did suspect any thing was represented amiss, this *George Keith* signified to him in a Letter; but *Thomas Upshare* refused to have the hearing of them; however both *Mr. Kinnier* and *John Sewel*, who were present at the said Conference, have attested to the Truth thereof, and have allowed me to signify the same.

POSTSCRIPT.

IT is greatly worthy of Observation, that the foresaid Confession of *Thomas Upshare*, That neither he nor his Brethren had either that degree, or that kind of Inspiration which the Prophets and Apostles had, doth quite overturn the Foundation of the Quakers Ministry, both with respect to the Ministerial Abilities and Call to their pretended Ministry; for when the Quakers Ministers were question'd both about their Abilities and Call to the Ministry, as neither being sufficiently gifted, nor duly and orderly called to that Work, many of their Preachers being very ignorant in the very Letter of the Holy Scriptures; and divers of them that could not read English, their common Answer was, that they were inwardly both gifted and called to the Ministry as the Prophets were, and immediately inspired and called as the Apostles, tho' they were not furnished with outward Learning, and had not School Education; but according to this Confession of *Thomas Upshare*, he hath overthrown the Foundation of both his and his Brethren's Ministry and Call, by his granting they have not the same Inspiration either in Degrees or Kind with that of the Prophets and Apostles; wherein he grossly contradicts their great Founder *George Fox*, (whom *Jos. Wyeth* and his Brethren call the Apostle of this Age) who hath affirmed, That the Quakers giving forth Papers or printed Books, is from the Immediate Eternal Spirit of God; and he hath pronounced a Curse upon all that speak and write, and not from

C

God.

God immediately and infallibly, as the Apostles did, and the Prophets and Christ, Great Myst. p. 105. 4.

These and many other Passages in his and other Quakers Books, together with what they daily profess, that they preach without Study or Premeditation, and consequently without the Help of Man or Books, sufficiently prove that they pretend to the same kind of Inspiration that the Apostles had, and Prophets, calling what they speak or writ, from their pretended inward Inspiration, *The Word of the Lord*, though they will not allow the Scriptures to be *the Word*. Besides, this Confession of *Thomas Upshare* doth contradict the Pretence of his daily Practice, who frequently pretends to speak in the Quaker's Meetings after the same manner, and by the same Authority as the Prophets and Apostles did, and consequently by the same kind of Inspiration, and highly applauding and commending his *sweet self*, in these following Words, as both I and others have heard him --- *I am full, I am full*, and concluding his Prayer with, *Amen, Amen, saith my sweet Soul*; and in a Letter of his to Mr. *Kinnier*, he makes it one of his Arguments, to prove that the Ministers of the Church of England are not the true Ministers of Christ, *because they were put to School for that purpose to become Ministers*; now the Ministers of Christ (saith he) *were never thus put to School*: But if the Quakers Ministers were not put to School, to be taught in order to the Ministry, nor yet have that Inspiration in kind that the Prophets and Apostles had, as surely they have not, they must be very unlearned, wanting both sorts of Qualifications; and how he or any of his Brethren can prove their *Call* to the Ministry, without either the *inward immediate Call* by Divine Inspiration, such as the Prophets and Apostles had, and without all *outward Call of Men*, is left to the Intelligent to judge. But another Argument of *Thomas Upshare*, in his said Letter to Mr. *Kinnier*, That the Ministers of Church of England are not true Ministers of Christ, is, *because they are actual Sinners*, and confess themselves to be actual Sinners in their daily Prayers; and because they are not perfect [with a sinless Perfection,] and bring not the People that hear them, to wit-
ness

ness a Sinless Perfection, that therefore they are no true Ministers of Christ; but at this rate he hath unministred both himself and all his Brethren, who no doubt have *actual Sin*, as well as other Men; and their Sin is the greater, that they will not confess it, and ask God the Forgiveness of their Sins, because generally they think they have *no Sin*; but I have heard say, that *John Rallet*, who useth to preach in Quakers Meetings, had prayed in the Quakers Meeting at *Colchester* for Forgiveness of Sins, both his and the People's Sins; and therefore by *Thomas Upshare's* Determination *John Rallet* is no Minister of Christ: For this and other Reasons, more especially for his preaching the *Man Jesus*, and the Resurrection, divers of the Quakers dislike him, and some of them did lately go away when they heard him so preach; but another great Offence they have at him is his favourable Opinion of *George Keith*, and that he will not come up in his Testimony with *Thomas Upshare*, and other Quakers, to call *George Keith* an Apostate, but tells them, *That George Keith is such an Apostate from the Quakers as Luther was from the Pope.* A further Account of *Thomas Upshare* and the Quakers of *Colchester*, their Dissatisfaction with *John Rallet*, who yet hath many Quakers, both at *Colchester* and elsewhere, to be his Friends, and who will, as is hoped, stand by him, and own him, if the contrary Party should excommunicate him, hereafter follows, in two short Papers, the one being writ by *Thomas Upshare*, the other by *John Rallet*. A third Argument of *Thomas Upshare* in his said Letter to Mr. *Kinnier*, that the Ministers of the Church of *England* are no true Ministers of Christ, is, *That the Ministers of Christ are a lowly People, such as labour with their Hands; that as they have freely received, so they might also freely give; but the Clergymen of England do not so; therefore, &c.* But this Argument, were it of any force, as it is not, is equally strong against very many of the Quakers Ministers, who work not with their Hands, as neither doth *Thomas Upshare*, as is well known to his Neighbours, and yet both he and his Family are highly maintained in Fulness and Idleness by the Quakers. It is well known that he has no Personal Estate, and was

a poor Weaver, before he turned Preacher among the Quakers; but not being able to maintain himself and his Family by his Weaving, in great part for his Idleness, (as some of his Neighbours have informed me) he did take himself to a more easie and profitable Trade of Preaching among the Quakers, a Method that most of the Preachers of the Quakers do practice; and yet this insolent Man, who is maintained by his Trade of Preaching, makes it a great part of his Business in his Preaching, to cry out against the Ministers of the Church of England, for having an outward Maintenance, and for not working with their Hands.

Colchester the 14th. of the 5th. Mo. 99.

I Do freely offer, That if John Rallet will come up in his Testimony with Friends in Colchester against George Keith, and promise by the Lord's Assistance to be quiet, and not either publicly or privately censure Friends in their Proceedings against him the said George Keith; that then I will use my greatest Interest to prevail with Friends in Colchester, that all which is past shall freely be forgiven or past by as if it never had been, and also do my utmost to put an end to those Reports that have flown about in Town or Country concerning him the said John Rallet, upon George Keith's Account.

Thomas Uphare.

To which John Rallet does say, It looks as if Thomas Uphare took on him to be Pope; however he further does say, he craves no Favour at his or their Hands, and do deny their false Charges against him on George Keith's Account, having never gone about to expose his Cause, &c. but I do look upon him for to be a very Honest Religious Man, and I think you have done him much Wrong.

John Rallet.

Daniel

Daniel Vandeval denied that Jesus Christ was in Heaven in his Humane Nature; and for any thing I could prove, he has left his Body behind, and will reassume it again.

And when I ask'd him, whether Jesus Christ interceded for us in Heaven? he answer'd, *Yea.*

Then I put the Question to him, whether he interceded for us as God, or as Man, he said, *I will not answer thee.*

He also did say, That the *Light within* him did tell him, without Scripture, that Christ was born of a Virgin, before divers Witnesses of good Credit in *Colchester.*

Colchester, Jan. 18. 1700.

Noah Raoul.

John Sewel hath declar'd, that some Months ago he heard *Sam. Cater* (a great Preacher among the Quakers) at a Meeting in the Country, say in his Preaching, *There are some now that boggle at the Light within, and tell of a Christ without us, we know not where.* The which, with other false Antichristian Doctrines of the Quakers, have occasioned him to forsake them; and for the like Reasons, his Wife, and divers others, formerly Quakers, both Men and Women, at *Colchester*, have forsaken the Quakers, and have been at the Church, where 'tis hoped they will continue: One of which, a Widow Woman, has got Three of her Children baptized, who all go to Church with her; and *John Sewel* and his Wife have signified their Resolutions to have Three of their Children baptized.

Robert Hoskins, a great Quaker, being ask'd by me at Widow *Till's* House in *Colchester*, January last, 1700. whether he believed that Christ would come to judge him and all Mankind at the great Day, in that Body which suffered on the Cross, and was laid in the Sepulchre? He answer'd, He believed he would come in his Body. I asked again, What Body that was? Whether that which suffered on the Cross, and was laid in the Sepulchre? He answer'd, It would be such a Body as God should please to give him. Which plainly intimates he doth not believe that Christ either has that Body, or will come in that Body that suffer'd on the Cross, and was laid in the

the Sepulchre, but some other Body that he has not yet received; and so for all the time betwixt our Saviour's Death and the Day of Judgment, he is in the State of the Dead, plain contrary to the Holy Scriptures, *Rom. 6. 9. 1 Cor. 15. 5.*

And I having before asked *Henry Pomford*, another Quaker then present, whether he believed *that Christ would come to Judgment in that Body that suffer'd on the Cross, and was laid in the Sepulchre?* He said he would not meddle with that, it was too high for him. Thus we see what profess'd Unbelievers noted Men among the Quakers are, in the very first Principles and Fundamentals of Christianity.

Some Passages faithfully collected out of a Book of George Fox's, call'd, A general Epistle, to be read in all the Christian Meetings in the World; sent to them by George Fox.

— **F**OR we have given our Money, and have spent our Labour after them, [*viz.* them he calls the World's Teachers] and hoped they would have fulfilled their Words, and brought us to the Knowledge of the Son of God; and so to the Unity of the Faith, and to a perfect Man, to our Father *Adam's* and *Eve's* State before they fell; and now they have gotten our Money, they hope we will not look for Perfection. Deceivers! we will never set foot more after them, who will neither fulfil their Words, nor give the Money back again; for we gave our Money, that they should bring us to the Knowledge of the Son of God, and to the Unity of the Faith, and bring us to a perfect Man, and to the measure of the Stature of Fulness of Christ. ——— And thus they deceived us, instead of bringing us to the measure of the Stature of Christ, who never fell, the second *Adam*, the Lord from Heaven, who said they would bring us to his Stature; and now they cannot bring us to the measure of the Stature of the Righteousness and Holiness of our Father *Adam* and Mother *Eve*, that they were in before they fell; but they had no body of Sin before they

they fell, nor Spot, nor Wrinkle, nor Blemish; so the Deceiver hath got our Money, and now call that an Error which they said they would bring us unto (a perfect Man) and so will not fulfil their Words, nor give the Money back again neither.

From these Passages, *Note 1.* How *G. Fox* grossly belied those he calls the World's Teachers, *i. e.* all Christian Teachers, not only in *England*, but throughout all Christendom, that they promised to bring their Flocks to [a Sinless] Perfection, before Death; for that's the true State of the Question betwixt the Quakers Ministers and all Christian Ministers, whether the Work of the Ministry doth bring either all or any of their Hearers before Death to a sinless Perfection, so as that they have no Sin in them? the Quakers say *Yea*, contrary to *1 John 1. 8.* and *James 3. 2.* *1 Kings 8. 46.* whereas Christian Ministers teach, that Persons under their Ministry, by the Help of God's Grace and Spirit continually assisting them, may before Death come to Perfection in the true Sense of Scripture, so as with Sincerity of Heart, to love God, and walk in all his Commandments, and to be free from the condemning and commanding Power of Sin, and from all, not only scandalous, but deliberate and wilful Sin, though still liable to sinful Imperfections.

Note 2. The Presumption and false Conceit of this grand Deceiver *George Fox* and his Brethren, who have presumed that they have already brought their Flocks to such a high State of Sinless Perfection, whereas the great Sins of many of them, both Teachers and People, frequently committed by them, of Drunkenness and Whoredom, and Defrauding, as have been sufficiently proved, and may be further proved, besides the great Ignorance, and vile Antichristian Errors that abound among them, (as did in this *George Fox*) and their intollerable Uncharitableness, under a Mask of Pharisaical Righteousness, give the Lie sufficiently to this their false Pretence.

Note 3. *George Fox* in these Passages, not only pretends to have brought his Hearers up to the State of *Adam* and *Eve* before they fell, but to the Stature of *Christ* that never fell; the first of which is ignorant Presumption, and the last plain Blasphemy, according to his Sense of it, as he has explained himself in his *Great Mystery*, p. 218, and 318. That the Quakers are come to the Fulness, to a perfect Man, and that (saith he) is above any degree.

Note 4. This gives to understand the Reason why the Quakers do not confess their Sins, nor pray for the Forgiveness of their Sins, because they are in their Conceit come to a sinless Perfection.

Note 5. Seeing it is sufficiently evident, that neither *George Fox* nor others of the Quakers Ministers have brought their Flocks to a sinless Perfection, according to their Promise, by *George Fox's* own Argument, he and they are *Deceivers*, and have unjustly taken their Money, which hath been many Thousand Pounds, that they have received of their Profelytes, and yet give them not their Money again, but most unjustly, by *George Fox's* Argument, detain it.

23 JY 69

F I N I S.

